

Remarks

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner rejected all of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,839,417 (Weisman).

2. Status of the Claims

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include subject matter substantially in line with what dependent claims 8 and 9 added, with some additional revisions, and Applicant has cancelled claims 8 and 9. Further, Applicant has added similar subject matter to claims 15, and Applicant has cancelled claims 17-30. Applicant has also amended claim 16 for consistency.

Now pending are claims 1-7 and 10-16, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

3. Note about Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant filed an information disclosure statement on January 12, 2004. Applicant assumes the Examiner has considered the art cited on that information disclosure statement. However, Applicant has not received an initialed copy of that information disclosure statement. To complete Applicant's records, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to mail a fully initialed copy of the information disclosure statement.

4. Response to Rejections

Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 15, as amended, patentably distinguish over Weisman, as Weisman fails to teach a switch receiving a feature code dialed by a user where the feature code corresponds with a subject matter, the switch sending the dialed feature code to a service control point (SCP), and the SCP using logic to select a teleconference that matches the location of the user and the subject matter corresponding with the dialed feature code, as recited in both of the independent claims.

Claims 8 and 9 recited use of a dialed feature code as the indication of subject matter. In rejecting claims 8 and 9, the Examiner relied on column 23, lines 39-54, of Weisman as allegedly teaching the recited subject matter. However, a review of that portion of Weisman reveals no teaching of the switch / SCP / dialed feature code arrangement that was recited in claims 8 and 9. Rather, the cited portion merely references a database schema. Applicant has also reviewed Weisman as a whole and submits that Weisman as a whole fails to teach the switch / SCP / dialed feature code arrangement noted above in the context of selecting a conference based on location and subject matter, as now recited in claims 1 and 15.

Because Weisman does not teach the invention recited in claims 1 and 15, Weisman does not anticipate those claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 15 are allowable. Furthermore, without conceding the Examiner's other assertions (and specifically without conceding various assertions by the Examiner that columns 23 and 24 of Weisman allegedly teach certain aspects of the dependent claims), Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-7, 10-14, and 16 are allowable for at least the reason that they each depend from an allowable claim.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims 1-7 and 10-16 are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests notice to that effect.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is welcome to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2141.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: May 5, 2008

By: /Lawrence H. Aaronson/
Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818